

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 7-11, 14, and 17 are amended. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found, for example, in the specification at page 14, line 12 and page 17, line 15 - page 18, line 5. No new matter is added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representatives by Examiners Lamb and Dhingra in the July 2 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action, on page 10, indicates that claims 7 and 9-10 recite allowable subject matter. Specifically, these claims are indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants appreciate this indication of allowability, but respectfully submit that at least claim 1, from which these claims depend, and the other claims depending from claim 1 are allowable for at least the reasons indicated below.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action rejects claims 4, 14, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 4 and 14 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's recommendation, and claim 20, as originally drafted recites, "wherein some of the one-dimensional filters", and therefore complies with the Examiner's recommendation. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

III. Double Patenting

The Office Action rejects claims 1-20 on the grounds of non-statutory double patenting over claims 1-43 of U.S. Patent No. 7,218,418 to Curry et al. Without admitting to the propriety of the rejection, and in the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicants are simultaneously filing herewith a Terminal Disclaimer over the cited reference, thus obviating the rejection. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

A. Fan in view of Acharya

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 8, 11-14, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,839,152 to Fan et al. ("Fan") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,725,247 to Acharya et al. ("Acharya"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1, 11, and 17 are amended to reflect a feature wherein the control module is placed subsequent to the filter bank unit in the process stream, see Fig. 1, so that a control signal may be sent to the filter bank unit from the control module and a pair of filters may be selected from the filter bank for blurring. This feature increases efficiency of the process because the complex computations are done only in the selected pair of filters and extra, time-consuming computations are not executed in the remaining filter bank filters.

Conversely, Fan teaches a system with two filters, and the input signal is manipulated by both filters and then blurred and blended. Acharya teaches a filter bank unit with a plurality of filters, but does not address the discrepancies of Fan. Neither Fan nor Acharya teaches the use of a control module generating a control signal to select a pair of filters from a filter bank. Therefore, neither Fan nor Acharya, individually or combined, teach or suggest all the features of amended claims 1, 11, and 17.

Claims 1, 11 and 17 would not have been rendered obvious by Fan and Acharya.

Claims 2-4, 8, 12-14, and 18-20 depend variously from claims 1, 11, and 17 and, thus, also would not have been rendered obvious by Fan and Acharya. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

B. Fan in view of Acharya and further in view of Cheung

The Office Action rejects claims 5-6 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Fan in view of Acharya and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,222,945 to Cheung et al. ("Cheung"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.


For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1 and 11 would not have been rendered obvious by Fan and Acharya. Cheung does not address the discrepancies of Fan and Acharya as to claims 1 and 11. Therefore, claims 1 and 11 would not have been rendered obvious by Fan, Acharya, and Cheung, claims 5-6 and 15-16 variously depend from claims 1 and 11 and, thus, also would not have been rendered obvious by Fan, Acharya, and Cheung. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Joel S. Armstrong
Registration No. 36,430

JAO:JSA/rle

Date: July 11, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
--